



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,470	05/31/2001	Hidenori Yokokura	35.C15431	6870

5514 7590 04/20/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,470

Applicant(s)

YOKOKURA, HIDENORI

Examiner

Dustin Nguyen

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 11 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- I. As per claim 7, the limitation of “a decision device adapted to decide whether or not the information for describing in the Web client a second screen image” is not clearly explained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2154

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 6-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Praitis et al. [US Patent No 6,594,697], in view of Yamamura et al. [US Patent No 6,028,838].

6. As per claim 1, Praitis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a network-connectable apparatus, comprising:

sending device [i.e. web server] [52, Figure 2; and col 5, lines 61-64] adapted to send information for describing a screen image which indicates in the other apparatus the reason for the access restriction if access by the other apparatus is restricted [Figures 3, 4, 8-11; col 5, lines 61-col 6, lines 9; and col 6, lines 48-65].

Praitis does not specifically disclose

judging device adapted to judging whether or not access by another apparatus should be restricted.

Yamamura discloses

judging device adapted to judging whether or not access by another apparatus should be restricted [Abstract; col 2, lines 26-31; and col 4, lines 42-58].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Praitis and Yamamura because Yamamura's teaching of judging device would enable to connect device in a more efficient manner.

7. As per claim 6, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Praitis discloses web server and web client [Figure 2].

8. As per claim 7, Praitis discloses a decision device adapted to decide whether or not the information for describing in the Web client a second screen image which indicates a status of a computer or a network apparatus having the Web server is stored in the Web server and has been updated [i.e. replacement page] [Abstract; col 2, lines 25-46], wherein if access to the Web server is not restricted, said notification device sends the information for describing the second screen image based on the decision by said decision device [i.e. display electronic document] [216, Figure 6].

9. As per claim 8, Praitis discloses wherein said notification device sends the information for describing the first screen image to the Web client regardless the decision by said decision device if access to the Web server is restricted [Figure 6; col 9, lines 64-col 10, lines 11].

10. As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

11. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.

12. Claims 2-5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Praitis et al. [US Patent No 6,594,697], in view of Yamamura et al. [US Patent No 6,028,838], and further in view of Yamada et al. [US Patent No 6,415,313].

Art Unit: 2154

13. As per claim 2, Praitis and Yamamura do not specifically disclose
detection device adapted to detecting time information related to the information
possessed by the other apparatus,

wherein said sending device sends information which indicates the status of the network-
connectable apparatus according to the time information detected by said detection device, if
access by the other apparatus is not restricted.

Yamada discloses

detection device [i.e. detecting unit] [140, Figure 2] adapted to detecting time
information related to the information possessed by the other apparatus, wherein said sending
device sends information which indicates the status of the network-connectable apparatus
according to the time information detected by said detection device, if access by the other
apparatus is not restricted [i.e. if-modified-since] [col 20, lines 20-col 21, lines 11].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made
to combine the teaching of Praitis, Yamamura and Yamada because Yamada's teaching of time
information would allow to keep information up to date to maintain information integrity.

14. As per claim 3, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore,
Yamada discloses the reason for the access restriction regardless of the time information sent by
the other apparatus if access by the other apparatus is restricted [i.e. updating] [Abstract; col
20, lines 35-58; and col 33, lines 58-col 34, lines 5].

15. As per claims 4 and 5, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1-3.

16. As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Conclusion

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154